UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

)	
IN RE YASMIN AND YAZ (DROSPIRENONE))	3:09-md-02100-DRH-PMF
MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES AND)	
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION)	MDL No. 2100
	``	

This Document Relates to:

This Document Relates to:

Bateman v. Bayer Corp., et al.	Case No. 3:10-cv-10042
Bremme v. Bayer Corp., et al.	Case No. 3:10-cv-10040
Brosch v. Bayer Corp., et al.	Case No. 3:09-cv-10151
Cottman v. Bayer Corp., et al.	Case No. 3:09-cv-10172
Driver v. Bayer Corp., et al.	Case No. 3:09-cv-10035
Holben v. Bayer Corp., et al.	Case No. 3:09-cv-10073
Johnson v. Bayer HealthCare Pharms., Inc., et al.	Case No. 3:10-cv-20006
Losse v. Bayer Corp., et al.	Case No. 3:10-cv-10025
McGarry v. Bayer Corp., et al.	Case No. 3:09-cv-10161
Mendicino v. Bayer Corp., et al.	Case No. 3:09-cv-10198
Merrell v. Bayer Corp., et al.	Case No. 3:09-cv-10112
Minardo v. Bayer Corp., et al.	Case No. 3:09-cv-10184
Panas v. Bayer Corp., et al.	Case No. 3:09-cv-10228
Reidenbaker v. Bayer Corp., et al.	Case No. 3:09-cv-10069
Richerson v. Bayer Corp., et al.	Case No. 3:09-cv-10121

Rodriguez v. Bayer Corp., et al.	Case No. 3:10-cv-10015
Sams v. Bayer Corp., et al.	Case No. 3:09-cv-10067
Shaffer v. Bayer Corp., et al.	Case No. 3:09-cv-10168
Suydam v. Bayer Corp., et al.	Case No. 3:09-cv-10141
Taylor v. Bayer Corp., et al.	Case No. 3:09-cv-10065
Tettamanti v. Bayer Corp., et al.	Case No. 3:09-cv-10186
Zuhr v. Bayer Corp., et al.	Case No. 3:09-cv-10102

ORDER

On March 8, 2010, the Bayer Defendants filed motions to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction in each of the above listed cases (total of 22 member actions). The basis for the motions was that, in each case, there existed one or more non-diverse defendants. As is explained below, the jurisdictional issue pertaining to these member actions has been resolved in all but two cases:

The Plaintiffs in 19 of the 22 member actions have dismissed the non-diverse defendant or non-diverse defendants and have filed amended complaints reflecting this revision. Thus, pursuant to the operative amended complaints, diversity jurisdiction now exists in the following member actions.

- 1. 3:10-cv-10025
- 2. 3:09-cv-10069
- 3. 3:09-cv-10121
- 4. 3:10-cv-10015
- 5. 3:09-cv-10168
- 6. 3:10-cv-10042
- 7. 3:09-cv-10035
- 8. 3:09-cv-10067
- 9. 3:09-cv-10168
- 10. 3:09-cy-10065

11.	3:10-cv-20006
12.	3:10-cv-10040
13.	3:09-cv-10151
14.	3:09-cv-10172
15.	3:09-cv-10073
16.	3:09-cv-10161
17.	3:09-cv-10198
18.	3:09-cv-10184
19.	3:09-cv-10141

As to member action **3:09-cv-10228** Plaintiff filed a motion for voluntary dismissal and the case has been closed.

As to the remaining two member actions, each Plaintiff shares citizenship with at least one defendant. In member action **3:09-cv-10112**, the Plaintiff and Defendant Bayer Healthcare LLC are both citizens of Indiana. In member action **3:09-cv-10102**, the Plaintiff and Defendant Bayer Healthcare Pharmaceuticals Inc. are both citizens of Delaware. Because the Plaintiffs in these member actions share citizenship with a named Defendant, this Court lacks diversity jurisdiction and Plaintiffs' actions must be dismissed.

Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** as follows:

The Bayer Defendants motions for dismissal in the following member actions are **denied** as **moot**:

3:10-cv-10025 3:09-cv-10069 3:09-cv-10121 3:10-cv-10015 3:09-cv-10168 3:10-cv-10042 3:09-cv-10067 3:09-cv-10168

```
3:09-cv-10065

3:10-cv-20006

3:10-cv-10040

3:09-cv-10151

3:09-cv-10172

3:09-cv-10073

3:09-cv-10161

3:09-cv-10198

3:09-cv-10184

3:09-cv-10141

3:09-cv-10228 (voluntarily dismissed)
```

The Bayer Defendants motions to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction in member actions $\bf 3:09-cv-10102$ and $\bf 3:09-cv-10112$ are $\bf granted$.

DATE: June 25, 2010

SO ORDERED:

/s/ David&Herndon

Chief Judge United States District Court